

# The Classical Weekly

Published on Monday, October 1 to May 31, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday (Election Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day, New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Easter Sunday, Decoration Day).  
Place of Publication, Barnard College, New York City. In the United States of America, \$2.00 per volume; elsewhere \$2.50.  
Single numbers, 15 cents each. Address all communications to Charles Knapp, at 1737 Sedgwick Avenue, New York City.  
Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized June 28, 1918.

VOLUME XXIV, No. 14

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1931

WHOLE No. 651

**The outstanding textbook for modern classes in  
third-year Latin**

**ULLMAN - HENRY - WHITE**

## THIRD LATIN BOOK

Diverges from the usual Ciceronian diet given to Latin students in the third year. Conforming with present day objectives in the study of Latin it offers a wealth of material from classical literature suited in interest and in difficulty to students of this grade level. This material has been selected to develop maximum facility in reading the language, together with maximum appreciation of Roman life and culture.

**It meets College Entrance Requirements and the  
recommendations of the Classical Investigation**

### *CONTENTS (Outline)*

Caesar's Civil War (Selections)	Seneca (Selections)
Pliny and Gellius (Selections)	Macrobius and Quintilian (Selections)
Petronius (Selections)	Cicero and Sallust (Selections)
Ovid's Metamorphoses (Selections)	

Vocabulary drills, word-studies, syntax, and questions for comprehension are ingeniously combined with the reading material

Price \$2.20

---

**THE MACMILLAN COMPANY**

New York    Boston    Chicago    Dallas    Atlanta    San Francisco

GREENOUGH, KITTREDGE, JENKINS  
**VIRGIL**  
AND OTHER LATIN POETS



"Your beautiful bimillennial Virgil is a book to be proud of. Rich in its abundance of Augustan literature—Virgil, Horace, Catullus, Ovid—it gives one a right to feel that he has taken a considerable step on the highways of culture. This satisfaction is enhanced by mechanical and artistic charms, for the book embodies the best in the printer's and binder's art, and delights the eye, as well as stimulates the imagination, with a profusion of pictures illustrative of that golden past. This wonderful book goes a long way toward making this Virgilian year memorable".  
—Charles E. Dixon, Head of the Latin Department, Eastern District High School, Brooklyn, N. Y.

**GINN AND COMPANY**

Boston    New York    Chicago    Atlanta    Dallas    Columbus    San Francisco

# The Classical Weekly

VOLUME XXIV, No. 14

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1931

WHOLE No. 651

## DR. WALTER LEAF'S HOMER AND HISTORY AND THE CATALOGUE OF THE SHIPS IN ILIAD 2

In a review of Mr. T. W. Allen's book, *The Homeric Catalogue of Ships*<sup>1</sup>, in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 17.20-23 (October 15, 1923), I mentioned some theses in the late Dr. Walter Leaf's book, *Homer and History*, which were hard to accept, and I referred to papers in which most of them had been carefully examined and rejected. To complete the case against these novelties three points have to be added. The first is a consideration of the startling Taphos-Corfu equation. That was dealt with in my review of *Homer and History* in *The Classical Review* 30 (1916), 82-83. Next, the strong affirmation in *Homer and History* (209-220) that there was no Mycenaean Corinth was the subject of correspondence between Dr. Leaf and myself in *The Classical Review*, which ended with my paper, *Mycenaean Corinth*, in the same journal, 38 (1924), 65-68. Mainly on the high authority of Dr. Carl Blegen, Dr. Leaf's proposition was found untenable. The third, Dr. Leaf's new view of Diomedes and his realm, I propose to discuss now. I shall add some general remarks on recent writings about the problems connected with the *Catalogue of the Ships*, in *Iliad* 2.

In presenting his case for Agamemnon's Panachaean dominion, Dr. Leaf gives us (223) a picture of Agamemnon's realm as he conceives it. First, he shows by map and compasses that Mycenae is fairly central in continental Greece. This fact is interesting, but of no practical importance, unless centrality of the capital is essential for the government of an empire. It has not generally been so regarded; empires usually grow, and seldom become exactly or approximately circular. Next, it is pointed out that the chiefs of Agamemnon's day can be grouped into an inner circle, an intermediate ring, and an outer ring consisting largely of the islands, which are of necessity in looser connection with the seat of government. But this does not help; the scheme is in fact little more than a fancy. Two questions still remain: Was there a government? If so, what was the nature of its dominion over the Achaean chiefs? On that point I may refer to my paper, *The Kingship of Agamemnon*, in *The Classical Quarterly* 11 (1917), 146-153. There is no evidence, and no ground whatever for supposing that Agamemnon had his garrisons throughout the country, and representatives who collected the revenue or saw to the regular transmission of tribute. He may have had a shadowy suzerainty in the Peloponnesus; we cannot say. His brother ruled Laconia, and he himself could dispose of territory

in what was afterwards Messenia. But it does not appear that Nestor acted as Warden of the Marches. He is but a faithful ally at Troy, like the rest.

For Argolis Dr. Leaf goes into detail (232-235). His "Cataloguer" (so he describes the author of the *Catalogue of the Ships in Iliad* 2) makes Diomedes king of that state, but Diomedes, it is argued by Dr. Leaf (235), "is no king", and "his kingdom is no kingdom..." He is "essentially a retainer with no status of his own..." (234), and his colleague Sthenelus and he are among the most obedient and faithful of Agamemnon's men. This is how Diomedes is said by Dr. Leaf to appear in "Homer", that is, in Homer outside the *Catalogue*. According to Dr. Leaf, the "Cataloguer", violating all the proprieties, and intent only on his work of dismemberment, makes Diomedes a king with a capital at Argos, and with a finer domain than Agamemnon himself possessed. The latter point I considered fully in a paper in *The Classical Review* 32 (1918), 3-7.

Dr. Leaf, intent on securing an imperial position for Agamemnon, degrades Diomedes on the strength of *Iliad* 14. 110-127. He regards Diomedes's speech there as the utterance of a man who cannot, without an apology, venture to rank himself, even after the appeal of Agamemnon, with those who are really kings. That is surely to read into the speech what one desires to find in it. The purpose of Diomedes's account of his descent is just as he himself describes it. Agamemnon is in one of his fits of despair, and wants to scuttle home. Odysseus rebukes his chief in the very strongest terms. 'The mean mind in authority' yields at once, and piteously calls for some better plan. Diomedes, associated now, as elsewhere, with Odysseus, answers Agamemnon's call for some one to speak. It is no wonder that he begins with an explanation. But he does not begin with an 'apology'; far from it. A few days before he had been called by Agamemnon on the field of battle a skulking coward, and had been told that he was 'far inferior to his sire'. Still more recently he had been reminded, on two separate occasions, of his extreme youthfulness by the *trisaeklisenex* of the camp, Nestor, ever ready to inculcate the superiority of age in council. So Diomedes, naturally of a diffident disposition, now hesitates to interpose, but all the same he is determined that the great enterprise shall not be brought to nought by the pusillanimity of his superior. He will speak his mind, as is his wont, but, with previous treatment still rankling, he takes care to make good his right to speak, and to anticipate any fresh objection to his intervention. His youth he need not dilate on, for Agamemnon practically invites him to speak, though he is *neos* (108). Nor need he refer to his capacity in the field; his deeds of the previous day, recounted in *Iliad* 5, 8, and 10, speak for themselves; compare

<sup>1</sup>Oxford: At the Clarendon Press (1921). In this paper the book is referred to, usually, merely by Mr. Allen's name. Dr. Leaf's book, *Homer and History*, was published in 1915 (London, Macmillan). For a review of the book, by Professor F. G. Allinson, see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 10.62-64.

also Iliad 9. 35-36. There remains his position as a chief; on that he insists. 'Ye shall not by saying I am by my lineage coward and poltroon despise the advice I may give', he declares (14. 126-127). So the poet, ready, as often, to give his hearers or readers a hero's descent, puts in Diomedes's mouth an account of Tydeus which would be welcome to them, but to Dr. Leaf, in his Introduction to Iliad 14 (second edition: 2.63), is a "long and untimely family history . . .", and, in his note on 14.114, "no doubt an interpolation of the genealogical school connected with the name of Hesiod . . ." In this way did Dr. Leaf, in an otherwise splendid edition of the Iliad, reduce the poem to fragments by methods which he afterwards formally abjured.

We do not in these days so readily reject the 'family histories' in the Homeric Poems. How very different is the treatment given to them in Professor Myres's great work! The family history with which we are here concerned tells how Tydeus—of whom more will be said presently—was a great spearman, acquired wealth, and married the daughter of the King of Argos, and so gives us the best of reasons for his admission to the royal family. His son is his successor in the kingship. He is peer of the King of Mycenae, and as such takes it upon himself to rebuke contemptible weakness even when it is exhibited by the Generalissimo. Diomedes is a hero whose modesty—he hesitates to speak in council, and does so only *ὅτε*—has always been commended as, after his bravery in the field, his most noteworthy quality. Of the speech we are considering Dr. Leaf's opinion (234) is that, if it be not "gross and patent affectation . . .", it is an apology. Affectation is the last weakness to be ascribed to Diomedes, and anything less like an 'apology' than this speech in Iliad 14. 110-127 it is difficult to imagine. A hypothesis is not to be established by such a travesty combined with a jeer at one of Homer's "family histories".

But, further, we are asked to conclude on the Homeric evidence that Diomedes and Sthenelus are unsurpassed as obedient and faithful retainers, or "men", of Agamemnon. That we cannot do. One has only to read the bitter reproofs administered to Agamemnon by Sthenelus in the Epipoleis (Iliad 4.404-410), and by Diomedes early in Iliad 9 (32-49), and to reflect whether the language is that of subordinates or of chiefs leagued for the fight at Troy, but still independent in their sovereignty. The two Argive leaders are loyal, and to that extent 'obedient', but they are not obedient to the point of allowing the expedition to fail through folly and cowardice. They know how to make allowance for a sorely tried and poorly gifted superior, but they brook no imputation from him, and will not be associated with him in his pusillanimity. Most readers of the Iliad will, I feel sure, agree with Seymour<sup>1</sup>, Life in the Homeric Age, 87, that "nothing indicates any special subordination on his <= Diomedes's> part to the king of Mycenae. . .". Diomedes is at Troy to help as an ally, but he knows how to assert his position as a

chief. It is true that he is not in the Iliad called King of Argos, but, as has often been remarked, much is taken for granted in the Iliad as known to hearers or readers. I believe I am correct in saying that outside the Catalogue Odysseus is nowhere in the Iliad, not even in 3. 201, described as King of Ithaka. Similar things can be said of other chiefs.

There is yet another point. Dr. Leaf is ready to accept a historical background for the War of the Seven against Thebes. On pages 226-228 he pictures the Agamemnon of the day as sitting fast in Mycenae, and filled with *ἐπιχαλπεκασία*—like our Agamemnon at a similar spectacle (Iliad 8. 77-78), and Zeus himself (Iliad 21. 389-390)—as he watched the two powers, "his rivals on either side cutting one another's throats . . .", hoping for the weakening of both, and muttering, no doubt, the Minoan equivalent of *Divide ut imperes*. The historical kernel may be real enough, and there is something Machiavellian in Iliad 4. 380, but inferences suggest themselves which Dr. Leaf does not seem to contemplate. That Argos and Thebes could go to war with each other would imply a measure of independence in these principalities not compatible with a Mycenaean empire over Greece in the generation before the Troica. The same independence is suggested in the Argives's request to Mycenae to assist them. They ask (Iliad 4. 379), for *κλειστόν ἐπικούριον*; that is the description regularly used in the Iliad of allies on the Trojan side who are quite independent of Priam. 'Homer' here confirms the "Cataloguer". Again, that Adrastus was King of Argos admits of no doubt. When, then, his own son fell among the Epigoni, the kingdom would naturally pass, since Tydeus had predeceased Adrastus, to Diomedes, who had married the king's daughter. Dr. Leaf describes (234) Tydeus as "a broken man", but it is clear that he had mended himself and had made a position for himself in Argos, when he was chosen to take a leading part in the Expedition against Thebes. Bellerophon's case is similar. When he had proved himself, he received the king's daughter in marriage and a *τέμενος*, and he was admitted as a member of the reigning house. Just so with Tydeus. Dr. Leaf himself, in his note on Iliad 14. 122, draws the inference. There is no reference there to Tydeus's broken condition. Such changes in dynasties were evidently not infrequent in prehistoric Greece, where many of the kingships, as those of Pylos, Sparta, and Aetolia, were not of long standing. They reflect the unsettled condition of the land for some time before the Trojan War.

As regards the royal seat of Tydeus and Diomedes, the town of Argos with its 'impregnable citadel' of Larisa, Dr. Leaf essays to prove (206-208) that it was always a mere town, "and not, in the military sense at least . . .", a capital with any command over the plain. This he tries to do by predicating (206) of such citadels that they "are not imperial, but municipal. They induce a sense of reliance on passive defence which is fatal to striking power. . .". It was thus (206-207) that Athens "came down to the plain. . ." from the Acropolis "to defend herself by the Long Walls and the Peiraeus. . .", and that Knossos and Sparta consciously based their strength on open towns. Similarly, says

<sup>1</sup>John L. Myres, *Who Were the Greeks?* (Sather Classical Lectures. Berkeley, California, University of California Press, 1930. Pp. xxvii + 634).

<sup>2</sup>Thomas Day Seymour, *Life in the Homeric Age* (first edition, New York, Macmillan, 1907. A second edition appeared in 1914).



Dr. Leaf (207), Tiryns and Troy were on low hillocks, not on unassailable rocks, though, really, on this view one must remark that the founders of these two settlements, or whatever we are to call them, did not disdain to do their utmost to make them impregnable. The remains of their walls are good evidence of that.

Mycenae, of course, must be, on Dr. Leaf's theory, an exception. That fortress and the impregnable Acrocorinthus did not induce a passive attitude on the part of their possessors, who, we are asked to believe, thought imperially and so were led to extend their dominion in Greece and even in distant islands. I recalled at once, as I read Dr. Leaf's statement, another striking exception. I lived for some years in India within sight of an impregnable hill-fort from which a humble Marátha chief, who refused to think municipally, founded an empire that spread over India, east and north and south. So, whatever the scientific historian may think of it, it seems to me that Dr. Leaf's view is a hasty and unacceptable generalization. I even venture to question the ancient examples on which it is based. Troy and Tiryns perhaps selected their low hillocks because higher situations were either not near enough or were too close to the sea. Athens and Knossos had fleets. The former did not abandon the Acropolis at an early period of her history. In Sparta's case there is the old explanation that a city's strength is the spirit of its citizens, not its walls.

Of the Argolid it is said by Dr. Leaf (203) that it has always been, for political purposes, almost as much an inland country as Arcadia; its only communications have been by land. And the important centres of population and military force have been chosen for the sake of these communications. There are three of them—Tiryns, Mykene, and Argos itself. . . .

Tiryns, it is admitted, had an obvious relation with the sea; it covered Nauplia. But Dr. Leaf fancies it would have been enough for that purpose to fortify the Palamidi. Tiryns was built (204) to command "the road to Epidaurus, and with it all the approaches to the Argolic peninsula from the south-east". On that side the Akté had good harbors. Trade came from them to the Argolid, not by Nauplia. In *The Classical Review* 32 (1918), 7, I have discussed these roads across the mountains. Except for one from Epidaurus, the literature of the subject seems to give no ground for believing in their existence, or that the ports of the Akté displaced Nauplia. It is said by Dr. Leaf on page 201 that Nauplia must have been unfavorable to navigation, because—at the present day—it has a shelving shore. But that does not prevent it from being a busy port. Steamers have to lie outside, their cargoes being sent ashore in boats or barges, but Mycenaean ships, probably not larger than these boats and barges, would be equally able to use the shore. Moreover, it may be said with confidence that conditions were not, three thousand years ago, what they are now. The silt deposited in that long period must have affected the coast seriously. In short, Dr. Leaf's speculations do not impair the validity of the view hitherto accepted by the authorities, that Nauplia was the port of Argolis from the earliest times. It is true that he devises a chronological scheme to show that from about 1200

B. C. to 1200 A. D. Nauplia was insignificant. The classical data are said to be few, and are easily disposed of, though Strabo's reference (8.6) to the port as a *ναύσταθμον* is not to be dismissed with the remark that it can hardly have been this at any time, and in Strabo's time must have been decaying, seeing that Pausanias (2. 38. 2) found it in ruins, for two centuries intervened between the periods of these writers. Nor does it appear how the date 1200 B. C., which is convenient as being just before Agamemnon's day, is fixed. For all the facts that are adduced, 1100 or 1000 B. C. would seem to suit equally well. Even Temenion is proscribed (200), but the way to condemnation is hard. The Argives once, it is said, set about connecting it with Argos by long walls. The Athenians had suggested this; the Spartans stopped it. Surely the obvious inference is that at Temenion there was a site for a good naval station. So it has to be added (200) that "Probably the Spartan invasion counted for less than the inherent difficulties of the task. . . ." Probably, it might be replied, the Athenians and the Argives had taken the trouble to ascertain that the difficulties could be overcome. That there was a port here at one time is shown by the remains of an ancient mole. If the place was useless, it is strange that the Dorians, when they appeared, seized and fortified it. So we may, it seems, keep the old belief that Nauplia was in Agamemnon's day, as it still is, the port of Argolis, and that the district was no more an inland country than Attica was.

But, further, and still as regards Argolis, there is the proposition (205-206) that Mycenae was fortified because a change had taken place in the position of the Minoan settlers in the Argolic Plain. As time advanced, Crete became of secondary interest to them, and communications with the Southeast were no longer a matter of concern. But there is now, says Dr. Leaf, a new power in the North, that has also come from out the sunrise, in Orchomenos and Thebes, and (205) the southern settlers' "dominant thought is to keep open their connexion, by way of the isthmus, with northern Greece. . . ." This is propounded as a possibility, and such of course it is. But it hardly seems a probable view. Why leave the valued communication to be cut at the Isthmus? On the other hand, if it was a descent from the North that the ruling power in the Northeast of the Peloponnesus feared, it would surely not commence its defense so far south as Mycenae, for Mycenae did not command all the passes into the southern Peloponnesus. There was a road to Argos from Corinth past Teneae. The power in question would block the easily fortified Isthmus, and could then, in comparative security, strike at the invaders' communications, or even at their capitals by landing a force on the northern shore of the Gulf. The Peloponnesus was easily defended against intruders from the North. Bérard's view<sup>4</sup>, that Mycenae was what the Turks called a *dervendji*, a castle built to command a *dervend* or defile through mountains, in order to compel a revenue from the passing traffic, is simpler and has much to commend it. If there was traffic past My-

<sup>4</sup>Victor Bérard, *Les Phéniciens et l'Odyssee*, I.11 (Paris, 1902).

cenae, such an opportunity for 'making the foreigner pay' would be as attractive as it is to some modern minds, and the fortified toll-house would be established as a matter of course.

The result of our investigation seems to be that we cannot accept this quite new view of Diomede and his realm any more than we can the other novelties in the chapters of Homer and History now under consideration. *Peccavit fortiter* must be the conclusion. No one, so far as I am aware, has entered the lists to defend them, and Homer and History—in so far, I am careful to add, as it relates to the Homeric geography, local and political—must, I submit, be classed with the works of those whom Eustathius describes as *τοὺς βασιλεύοντας Ὀμήρου*. Readers of it must be on their guard against being misled by its positive tone, reinforced by a conspicuously clear and attractive style.

(To be concluded)

ST. ANDREW'S,  
PIFE, SCOTLAND

A. SHEWAN

### VESTAL VIRGINS AND RUNAWAY SLAVES

After the Battle of Philippi disorders and dearth reached so acute a stage in Italy that multitudes of slaves deserted to the forces of Sextus Pompey, who was in control of Sicily and the adjacent waters<sup>1</sup>. Dio reports the situation as follows<sup>2</sup>:

... Thus reinforced... by the multitude of slaves who kept arriving from Italy, he gained tremendous strength; in fact, so many persons deserted that the Vestal Virgins prayed over the sacrifices that their desertions might be checked.

That the Vestals should be called upon for prayer in such a crisis may seem strange, but there is proof that their prayers were believed to be potent in such cases. Pliny the Elder says (N. H. 28.13): *Vestales nostras hodie credimus nondum egressa urbe mancipia fugitiva retinere in loco precationibus*. The context seems to indicate that *precatio* here is incantation rather than supplication, and W. Warde Fowler classified these *precationes* as an instance of magic<sup>3</sup>.

But what have the Vestals to do with runaway slaves? So put, the question suggests its own answer. In some sort the Vestals may have represented an asylum or sanctuary for abused and suppliant slaves, and their *precatio* may have constituted an abnegation of the State's asylum. Whatever is the degree of dependence of Vesta on Hestia<sup>4</sup>, Cicero at least had some reason for making them identical<sup>5</sup>: *ea <= Vesta> est enim quae ab illis <= Graecis> 'Hestia dicitur*. We know that the sanctuary of Hestia, whether it was represented in a public altar or in the hearth of a

private household, provided asylum to the suppliant<sup>6</sup>. It is true that in Athens the Theseion was the recognized asylum whither slaves might flee and demand that their cruel owners be compelled to sell them to more humane masters<sup>7</sup>. But in Hellenistic times, in Egypt, as we learn from the evidence in Friedrich von Woess's interesting book, *Das Asylwesen Ägyptens in der Ptolemäer Zeit* (Munich, 1923), even the hearth in a private home was considered adequate asylum for a fugitive slave<sup>8</sup>. Woess goes so far as to say that it was because such intruders were so frequent, so annoying to the family, and so difficult to eject that people came to build altars out in front of their houses, where runaways could take refuge<sup>9</sup>. Even the Jews, for whom the hearth had no special religious significance, were constrained to provide their houses with accessible hearths, in order not to appear less humane than their fellow Alexandrians<sup>10</sup>.

This discussion is intended as speculation, and in no sense as argument. The mutually corroborative testimony of Dio and Pliny is interesting. If the Vestals had power to offer asylum in a special sense, the fact would in itself be interesting and would offer another bit of evidence in the study of the relationship between Vesta and Hestia. It is well known that Roman lawyers were constantly exercised in nullifying notions of asylum brought to Rome from Greece and the Orient<sup>11</sup>.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

MOSES HADAS

### REVIEWS

Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire. By A. M. Duff. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press (1928). Pp. xii + 252. \$5.

The subject selected for discussion by Mr. A. M. Duff in his book, *Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire*, has never received comprehensive treatment. His book, therefore, constitutes a contribution to our knowledge of a class of the population of the Roman world that played an important part in the economic, social, and political life of the Empire. It is Mr. Duff's purpose to offer (Preface, v) "... a comprehensive discussion of their <= the freedmen's> many-sided activity and influence <which> has been looked for in vain. This is the gap I have aspired to fill".

The contents of the book are as follows:

Preface (v-vii); Contents (ix-xii); I. The Slave Market (1-11); II. Manumission (12-35); III. Legal Relations between Patron and Freedman (36-49); IV. Social Status of Freedmen (50-71); V. Grades of Freedmen (72-88); VI. Freedmen in Private Life (89-128); VII. Freedmen in Public Life (130-142); VIII. Im-

<sup>1</sup>See my monograph, *Sextus Pompey*, 75 (New York, Columbia University Press, 1930).

<sup>2</sup>Dio 48.19.4, in the translation of Earnest Cary (in *The Loeb Classical Library*), 5.259 (London and New York, 1917).

<sup>3</sup>The Religious Experience of the Roman People, 53 (London, 1911).

<sup>4</sup>For a summary of the arguments which have been suggested for and against the complete independence of Vesta from Hestia see Sosa's article on Hestia in Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, 8.1261, 1264-1265. The literature is cited also in G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, 137, notes (Munich, Beck, 1912). I have not been able to see A. Preuner, *Hestia-Vesta* (Tübingen, 1864), but Preuner repeats his views in his article on Hestia in Roscher's *Lexicon*, *Ausführliches Lexicon der Griechischen und Römischen Mythologie*, 1.2605-2652.

<sup>5</sup>*De Natura Deorum* 2.67; compare *De Legibus* 2.29.

<sup>6</sup>Preuner, in Roscher's *Lexicon* (1.2624-2625), cites the ancient evidence.

<sup>7</sup>J. H. Lipsius, *Das Attische Recht und Rechtsverfahren*, 643 (Leipzig, 1908).

<sup>8</sup>Woess, 75.

<sup>9</sup>Woess, 86.

<sup>10</sup>See Philo, *De Virtutibus* 124, and compare E. R. Goodenough, *The Jurisprudence of the Jewish Courts in Egypt*, 33-54 (New Haven, 1929).

<sup>11</sup>T. Mommsen, *Römisches Strafrecht*, 458 (Leipzig, 1899); Pauly-Wissowa, article *Asylon*, 2.1880-1886. I may add that interesting material is to be found in N. M. Nicolsky, *Das Asylrecht in Israel*, *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 48 (1930), 146-175, and in Edward Westermarck's article *Asylum*, in Hastings' *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, 1.161-164 (this gives many instances from primitive civilizations).

perial Freedmen (143-186); IX. Governmental Policy Towards Freedmen and Their Influence on Society (187-209); Appendix I: Date of the *Lex Iunia* (210-214); Appendix II: The *Ius Anuli Aurei* (214-220); Appendix III: The Imperial Civil Service (221-228); Appendix IV: Bibliography of Ancient Sources and Modern Authorities (229-232); Appendix V: Freedmen in the *Γνώμων τοῦ Ἰδίου Λόγου* (233-236); Index (233-252).

Mr. Duff does not plunge at once in *medias res*. Although the book is to deal only with the freedmen of the Empire, the author is on solid ground in introducing his subject by giving a brief sketch of the slave problem during the Republic and of the sources of the slave supply. This latter point is especially important, since the supply of slaves during the Empire tended to decrease (2). Thus Mr. Duff finds it necessary to ask from what new sources the supply was drawn (3-8). In this chapter Mr. Duff also touches briefly but adequately upon the different origins and characters of the various groups of slaves—the Western and the Eastern. He emphasizes especially the latter; every reader of Juvenal, for example, can readily understand Mr. Duff's reason for doing so. In this connection, as well as in the Bibliography, I miss the mention of an important article of Professor G. La Piana, Foreign Groups in Rome During the First Centuries of the Empire (*Harvard Theological Review* 20 [1927], 183-203).

While Chapter I presents information more or less known or at least accessible, Chapter II is the result of painstaking research. Here the question of manumission in its various forms is taken up. Here again Mr. Duff prefaces his discussion of Roman manumission by a brief survey of the problem in Greece (12-14). Although the Greeks were much more humane than the Romans, they were less liberal in freeing their slaves. But there were reasons for this. Slaves were never as numerous in Greece as they were at Rome (14); furthermore, in Greece slaves lacked all those opportunities which were open to them in Rome in the domestic sphere, i. e. in the great households. Further, in Greece slaves were not freed that they might become 'clients'.

After this comparison Mr. Duff examines the motives that prompted the Romans to free so many of their slaves, e. g. vanity—the desire to have a large clientele (18), disinterested altruism, the influence of Stoic philosophy (19). These, as well as many other factors, are carefully scrutinized. Nor is the problem of the *peculium* (16-18) omitted. We have then an excellent account of the forms of manumission and a brief analysis of the policy of the Roman government in regard to freedmen (26-35); in this last connection special emphasis is laid upon the reforms of Augustus (30-34). The conclusion is interesting and worth quoting (35): "...Roman law in imperial times did not treat slaves as mere soulless chattels, and did not deny them all the elementary rights of a human being...."

So far, however, as the policy of Augustus toward

manumission is concerned, I do not think that Mr. Duff makes out fully his case. To check the oriental-ization of the Metropolis through the influx of foreign blood from the East, Augustus imposed severe limitations upon manumission, says Mr. Duff (30-34). If the legislation of Augustus had this end in view, how can we reconcile with this action the fact that he recognized (61) "...as legitimate all marriages between *ingenui* and *libertini*, provided the free-born party was not a member of a senatorial family..."? To check on the one hand manumission for the purpose of preserving the original stock and on the other to permit intermarriage seems paradoxical. Mr. Duff indeed, is, as a matter of fact, surprised at these contradictory actions of Augustus. He tries to explain the difficulty by maintaining that a probable decline in the Roman stock prompted Augustus to make an exception (61). But, from the logical point of view, it seems to me that, if Augustus had been minded to put a stop to the deterioration of the native stock, he would as a first measure have prohibited intermarriage altogether. Again, it seems to me to be a contradiction on Mr. Duff's part to claim that Augustus enacted his measures to prevent Orientalization (34, 60-61) and then to say (207-208), "...Even in Augustus' day the process of Orientalization had gone too far. The great emperor saw the clouds, but he did not know that they had actually burst. His legislation would have been prudent and not a whit excessive a century earlier; but in his time Rome was a cosmopolitan city and the doom of the Empire was already sealed."

On page 30, Mr. Duff says: "...Romans continued to free their slaves at an alarming rate, and, by so doing, filled society with a mass of foreigners whose presence transformed Rome into a cosmopolitan city..." (compare also page 208). He quotes in support of this assertion Lucan, Seneca, Juvenal, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus. But Sallust, for example, had no better opinion of the metropolis than Lucan had. To Lucan (7.405) Rome was a city *mundi faece repleta*; to Sallust (*Bellum Catilinum* 37.4) it was a *sentina* which absorbed all those disgraced by crime or by vice. Cicero, too (*Ad Atticum* 2.19.4) calls the city a *sentina*. Tacitus (*Annales* 15.44) calls Rome...*urbem quo cuncta undique atrocia aut pudenda confluent celebranturque*.

The claims which patrons made upon their freedmen, the legal status of the freedmen, and the limits of the patrons' power form the gist of Chapter III, which is one of the best chapters of the book. Here Mr. Duff elucidates the meaning of the vague terms *obsequium* and *officium*, terms whose meaning had never before been properly formulated (34, 40). I was surprised, however, at one thing. In support of the statement that the reign of Claudius was called the Saturnalia of the freedmen (39) Mr. Duff quotes Friedlander's *Sittengeschichte*. Why not quote the original sources, Seneca, *Apocolocyntosis* 12.2 (compare 6.2), and Dio Cassius 60.19.3?

It was difficult in many cases for a slave to acquire his freedom. Besides, the acquisition of that longed-for goal did not end his difficulties. It is natural that, as a free man, a former slave should crave some of the

<sup>1</sup>On page 1 the title of Chapter I is given as "The Slave-Market." On page 233 the title of Appendix V is given as "Freedmen in the *Gnomon of the Idios Logos*." This is poor book-making. C. K. >



social advantages and privileges enjoyed by the free-born. Peculiarly enough, he could secure many of these for his descendants, but in his own case the stigma of his former slavery could not be obliterated. In other words, though freedmen in the long run reached the point where they could not be dispensed with in many a department of Roman life, they could not break down the wall of prejudice, racial and social, which had been erected in their path by the nobles and the intellectuals. This fact and the generosity with which manumission was granted sound almost paradoxical. It seems strange, too, that in the municipalities of Italy and in the provinces the freedmen had better chances and were not discriminated against as greatly as was the case in the metropolis. From the human point of view, then, Chapter IV, in which all the disabilities and disadvantages against which freedmen had to struggle are described, is of special interest.

Freedmen were graded. Their civil rank usually followed that of their patron, i. e. it varied as the patron was a Roman citizen, or had Latin rights, or was merely a *peregrinus*. To these different grades of freedmen Chapter V is devoted. Here we find a valuable discussion of the *ius anuli aurei* (85-88). In this chapter, I note that Mr. Duff applies (73) to Milo, Antony, and Sextus Pompey the term "adventurer". I do not question the application of this term in the case of Milo; but in the case of Antony it is surely misapplied. So as far as Sextus is concerned, Mr. Duff follows the general opinion of the biased historians of the Empire. In a recent examination of the evidence Dr. M. Hadas (Sextus Pompey, a Columbia University Dissertation, 1930) has removed this stigma from this unlucky scion of Pompey the Great.

Mr. Duff now passes to discuss the private life of the freedmen (Chapter VI). He gives us a fascinating account of the ways and means which freedmen employed to overcome all the restrictions placed in the way of their efforts to secure a livelihood, whether at Rome or in the provinces. We find freedmen in every walk of life: in domestic service (where they were graded according to their abilities), in agriculture, on the stage, in the circus and the arena, in factories, and in the professions of medicine, teaching, etc. In other words, they played an important part in the industrial and professional world. The rôle they played in public life was also considerable (Chapters VII, VIII), although in this last named sphere their servile past was always against them. The reigns of Caligula, Claudius, and Nero clearly show the unparalleled sway the freedmen exercised. Their rôle in the imperial civil service is well known. It was not until the second century A. D. that their power suffered a serious—and rightly deserved—setback.

It is seen, then, that freedmen left their mark in every department of Roman life and history, social, economic, and political. This was due also to the fact that the Roman government pursued toward them a definite policy, which, though it varied at times, can nevertheless be traced along three lines (188), "... the conservative, the utilitarian, and the progressive or

humanitarian..." This interesting problem occupies the last chapter (IX). But other problems, too, are touched upon here, e. g. the influence of Christianity and Stoicism upon the humanitarian movement (196-197), the religious influence of freedmen (204-206), and their contribution to the disintegration of the Empire (207-209).

Of the five Appendices, I consider the first and the second of great importance. In the first Mr. Duff argues with much cogency that the *Lex Iunia* is to be assigned to 17 B. C., because it coincides with the rest of Augustus's legislation about freedmen (214). The second appendix, on the *Ius anuli aurei* (compare also 85-88), elucidates some difficult points which Professor A. Stein, in his excellent book, *Der Römische Ritterstand* (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 22.172-175), failed to solve. As against Professor Stein, Mr. Duff proves that the grant of the *ius anuli aurei* did not give the recipient the *equus publicus* (218; see also the Conclusion, 220).

On the whole, Mr. Duff has produced a praiseworthy piece of work, well written and well documented by the evidence derived from literary, legal, and epigraphical sources. The brief list of modern authorities, however (231-232), ought to include, in addition to the article of Professor G. La Piana, mentioned above, the valuable dissertations of Dr. Marion E. Park, *The Plebs in Cicero's Day* (Bryn Mawr, 1918 <see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 15.211-213. C. K.>), and Dr. Eugen Koeser, *De Captivis Romanorum* (Giessen, 1904).

HUNTER COLLEGE,  
NEW YORK CITY

JACOB HAMMER

An Introduction to Greek. By Henry Lamar Crosby and John Nevin Schaeffer. New York: Allyn and Bacon (1928). Pp. xxv + 349 + 48. \$1.80.

The new book for the first year of the study of Greek, a book by Messrs. Crosby and Schaeffer, is a welcome addition to the long list of its competitors in the field. It presents the usual material in an Introduction (xv-xxv) and seventy-nine Lessons (1-273). A Grammatical Appendix, including review vocabularies, follows (275-334). There is a useful dictionary of proper names (335-340), followed by two Vocabularies (Greek-English, English-Greek), and an Index, separately paged (1-48). There are one hundred and ten illustrations, almost all photographic reproductions. With a few exceptions these are clear and attractive. The frontispiece is a reproduction in color of the painting, *A Reading from Homer*. The photographs are well chosen to illustrate Greek archaeology, art, architecture, history, private and public life, and in a few cases Greek influence in the modern world. With these there are explanatory notes. This material, together with the numerous graded and annotated selections in Greek, which are taken from the whole range of Greek literature, gives the beginner such glimpses of Greek achievement as are sure to whet his appetite for further study in the field. Special attention is paid also to word-formation and to the study of English derivatives from Greek.



My judgment of the book, based on six weeks' use of it in Summer School with College students, is overwhelmingly favorable. With this book it is possible to devote a good part of the recitation period to an appreciation of the most interesting civilization in history. It is surely good pedagogy to let the student do his hard work outside of class and to make his hour with the instructor, so far as is possible, entertaining and stimulating. Especially when students limit themselves to one or two years of Greek, as happens in the majority of cases in our Colleges, such a book as this is indispensable, if they are to learn anything beyond the dry bones of Greek. Further, the more leisurely progress in Greek grammar that is indicated in this book will probably produce more enduring results than a more rapid assault on the language. It is a pleasure to use the book and to see how it adds to the interest of students in their work.

By way of criticism I suggest that for College students the work is too much simplified. It is easier to remember details if they are presented as parts of a co-ordinated whole. The use of cases, for instance, might have been presented more systematically. Surely it is easier to learn the genitive, the dative, and the accusative of time in one lesson than in three. The present imperative is no more satisfactorily treated here than in other textbooks. The meanings 'desist' and 'resist' for the negative certainly deserve mention. The relegation of dual and vocative to the Appendix seems justified, but the avoidance of technical terms and of historical analysis of forms seems to me to be carried too far. Perhaps, however, it is well that something should be left to the teacher.

The misprints, some of them annoying, will doubtless be corrected in a later edition. It is rather a shock to find 'charity' (62) and 'tact' (117) listed among derivatives from the Greek. The first quotation from Menander on page 259 might have been referred to its play, the *Perikeiromene*. In one or two cases essential explanations are lacking. Some of the sentences, both Greek and English, are less idiomatic than they might be. Such obvious flaws are, however, insignificant in comparison with the very great virtues of the book, and to dwell on them would be ungrateful in view of the devoted toil that must have been required to produce the work. The authors' reward for their toil will be largely vicarious, but those whose labors are lightened by it will recognize the greatness of the debt that they owe to Professors Crosby and Schaeffer.

Haverford College,  
Haverford, Pennsylvania

L. A. POST

#### THE JACOB COOPER GREEK PRIZE<sup>1</sup>

Established in Memory of Jacob Cooper,  
Professor of Greek at Rutgers College, 1866-1893

A prize of one thousand dollars (\$1,000), to be known as The Jacob Cooper Greek Prize, is offered by Mr. Drury W. Cooper, in memory of his father, who was for many years Professor of Greek at Rutgers College. This prize will be awarded to a candidate taking the ex-

aminations of the College Entrance Examination Board in June 1931, to be selected in the following manner:

- (1) Among the answer books in Three-Year Greek written in ordinary course at the June 1931 examination of the College Entrance Examination Board, the ten best papers will be selected.
- (2) These ten papers will be submitted to a committee of three appointed by the American Philological Association, and the decision of a majority of these three shall carry the award.
- (3) The Committee on Award shall have the power to reject all answer books as not coming in their judgment to the necessary standards of excellence.
- (4) Upon being notified of the award the donor will remit the sum of one thousand dollars (\$1,000) to a suitable person, by whom the money shall be expended toward the payment of College tuition fees, room rent, living expenses, etc., from time to time as required during the Freshman year of the successful candidate.
- (5) The applications of all contestants for The Jacob Cooper Greek Prize must be submitted to and accepted by the Committee on Award or its representative in advance of the examination. The Committee on Award will be at liberty to adopt any regulations which in its opinion may be desirable in order to exclude candidates who have studied Greek for more than three years or candidates whose School records are unsatisfactory.
- (6) If the successful candidate shall fail during his Freshman year to maintain a satisfactory record in respect to scholastic standing or personal conduct, he will forfeit his claim to any unpaid part of the prize.

For further particulars address Professor Thomas S. Fiske, The Secretary of the College Entrance Examination Board, 431 West 117 Street, New York City.

#### MARTIAL 12.57.21-22

A Detroit despatch to the New York Times, under date of November 6, 1930, announced the death, at the age of sixty-five, of Washington Irving Robinson, lawyer, whose five-acre vineyard in the midst of the city for years supplied Detroit Churches with sacramental wines. This at once recalls Martial 12.57.21-22:

et rus in urbe est vinitorque Romanus  
(nec in Falerno colle maior autumnus) . . .

Martial has been complaining that in Rome there is no quiet, no sleep for a poor man. But of such things Sparsus (17-21) can know nothing, because he has country in the town and a Roman (i. e. a dweller in the town, not a *rusticus*) for his vine-dresser (not even on Falernian Hills is there a richer crop of wine).

MacMurray College,  
Jacksonville, Illinois

MARY JOHNSTON

#### HORACE WALPOLE ON "CHAIRS"

In THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 23.191-192 Professor Knapp has a paper entitled Some Remarks on "Chairs" in English Literature. In Walpole's Letters I found a reference to chairs that surprised me, for, so far as I knew, in all periods people sat in the *sella* or sedan-chair. In a letter to George Montagu, Esq., dated March 25, 1761, Walpole says: "... My ancient aunt... said to me... 'Child, you have done a thing today that your father never did in all his life; you sat as they carried you,—he always stood the whole time'".

MacMurray College,  
Jacksonville, Illinois

MARY JOHNSTON

<sup>1</sup>This statement is based on a circular issued by the College Entrance Examination Board. C. K.

**THE PHILADELPHIA CLASSICAL SOCIETY**

The Philadelphia Classical Society held its Fall Dinner at Memorial Hall, University of Pennsylvania, on Thursday evening, November 20. The guest of honor was Professor Torquato Carlo Giannini, Professor of Jurisprudence at the University of Rome. Professor Giannini delivered a brief but interesting talk on Vergil's thorough acquaintance with the nautical lore of his day, as evidenced in the Aeneid.

Professor John C. Rolfe, of the University of Pennsylvania, related his experiences as one of the Guides on the First Vergilian Cruise. Professor Hadzsits, also of the University of Pennsylvania, who recently returned from the American Academy of Classical Studies at Rome, where he was Visiting Professor last year, spoke of the Academy and its facilities for research.

One hundred and ten members of the Society were present.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

FRANKLIN B. KRAUSS,  
*Secretary*

**THE CLASSICAL CLUB OF PHILADELPHIA**

The 210th meeting of The Classical Club of Philadelphia was held on Friday, April 4, 1930, with thirty

members and guests present at the annual dinner, which preceded the formal meeting. The guest of honor, Professor Wilfrid P. Mustard, of The Johns Hopkins University, read the paper of the evening. His subject was Aeneas Silvius the Second. He gave an account of the interesting and adventurous life of Pope Pius II, and of his works, especially his personal letters.

The Club advanced its regular November meeting to October 15, the bimillennial fête of Rome's greatest poet, who was also one of the greatest poets of all time. The Club tendered a dinner to the Shade of Vergil. Fifty-four guests were present; and there is reason to believe, from the Vergilian atmosphere pervading the gathering, that the distinguished guest of honor personally graced the feast. He, however important, was immaterial. Four addresses were made in his honor. Professor John C. Rolfe told of the places associated with Vergil himself and with the characters of his great epic. Professor George D. Hadzsits explained Vergil's attitude toward the cult of Cybele. Professor L. R. Shero praised Vergil, the Scholar-Poet. Professor D. P. Lockwood spoke on Vergil in the Renaissance, showing that the story of the poet in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries is the history of humanism.

B. W. MITCHELL, *Secretary*.